

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FALL CREEK/WHITE RIVER TUNNEL
GROUNDWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN
FINAL REPORT
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary.....	ES-1
1. Introduction	1-1
1.1 Project Background	1-1
1.2 Project Scope and Objectives	1-1
1.3 Report Organization.....	1-2
1.4 Abbreviations	1-4
1.5 Common Terminology	1-5
2. Project Area.....	2-1
2.1 Topography, Surface Water and Climate.....	2-1
2.2 Soils.....	2-3
2.3 Bedrock	2-6
2.4 Hydrogeology.....	2-9
3. Conceptual Groundwater Model.....	3-1
3.1 Horizontal Model Boundaries	3-1
3.2 Vertical Model Boundaries.....	3-2
3.3 Groundwater Considerations.....	3-2
3.3.1 Hydraulic Properties	3-2
3.3.2 Recharge	3-4
3.3.3 Discharge.....	3-5
3.3.4 Flow Paths	3-5
4. Groundwater Model Development.....	4-1
4.1 Software Application	4-1
4.2 Model Grid and Boundary Conditions	4-1
4.3 Aquifer Parameters.....	4-5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4.3.1	Aquifer Layering and Thickness.....	4-5
4.3.2	Aquifer Hydraulic Characteristics	4-7
4.4	Recharge from Precipitation	4-13
4.5	Groundwater Interaction with Rivers and Streams	4-14
4.6	Wells.....	4-16
4.7	Steady-State Modeling	4-18
5.	Model Calibration and Sensitivity Analyses	5-1
5.1	Standard Practice for Regional Groundwater Models	5-1
5.2	Field Measurements and Published Groundwater Levels	5-2
5.3	Calibration Procedure	5-7
5.4	Results of Calibration.....	5-8
5.5	Sensitivity Analysis	5-14
5.6	Existing Conditions Model	5-17
5.6.1	Existing Conditions Model Parameters.....	5-17
5.6.2	Groundwater Flow Budget.....	5-23
6.	Alternative Scenarios	6-1
6.1	Development of Alternative Tunnel Scenarios.....	6-1
6.2	Model Development for Alternative Scenarios.....	6-4
6.3	Modeling Results	6-5
6.3.1	Scenario #1	6-7
6.3.2	Scenario #2.....	6-7
6.3.3	Scenario #3.....	6-12
6.3.4	Scenario #4	6-12
6.3.5	Scenario #5.....	6-12
6.3.6	Scenario #6.....	6-20
6.3.7	Scenario #7, #8, #9.....	6-20
6.3.8	Scenario #10, #11, #12	6-20
6.3.9	Impact on Existing Wells.....	6-20
6.3.10	Higher Summertime Pumping Rates from City Wells.....	6-31
6.3.11	Extreme Scenario Modeling	6-34
6.3.11.1	Extreme Scenario A.....	6-34

TABLE OF CONTENTS

6.3.11.2	Extreme Scenario B.....	6-39
6.3.11.3	Extreme Scenario C.....	6-39
6.3.12	Potential for Exfiltration During Long-Term Tunnel Operation.....	6-43
6.3.13	Summary of Modeling Results	6-43
7.	Groundwater Risk Registry.....	7-1
7.1	Hazard Identification and Initial Risks	7-2
7.2	Risk Management and Mitigation.....	7-13
7.3	Risk Register Application	7-13
8.	Conclusions and Recommendations.....	8-1
8.1	Conclusions.....	8-1
8.2	Recommendations.....	8-7
9.	References	9-1

Tables

		<u>Page</u>
Table ES.1	Summary of Alternative Scenarios Modeling Results.....	ES-9
Table ES.2	Summary of Key Recommendations	ES-14
Table 2.1	Marion County Bedrock Stratigraphy to the Silurian System - Fall Creek/White River Tunnel	2-7
Table 4.1	Conceptual Model Layer Representation.....	4-5
Table 4.2	Estimated Hydraulic Properties of Aquifer Layers.....	4-11
Table 4.3	Average Baseline Hydraulic Conductivities Assigned to Model	4-13
Table 4.4	Estimates of Groundwater Recharge	4-14
Table 5.1	Potentiometric Water Surface Elevations Measured for the Carbonate Aquifer.....	5-3
Table 5.2	Groundwater Elevations for Surficial Aquifer.....	5-6
Table 5.3	Differences in Groundwater Levels	5-6
Table 5.4	Groundwater Model Calibration Results	5-8
Table 5.5	Sensitivity Analysis	5-16

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table 6.1	Alternative Tunnel Scenarios.....	6-3
Table 6.2	Infiltration Rates along Tunnel Alignment.....	6-4
Table 6.3	Drawdown During Construction.....	6-30
Table 6.4	Pumping Rates Evaluated for City Water Supply Wells	6-33
Table 6.5	Summary of Alternative Scenarios Modeling Results.....	6-45
Table 7.1	Risk Probability	7-3
Table 7.2	Risk Consequence.....	7-4
Table 7.3	Risk Score Matrix.....	7-5
Table 7.4	Example Format and Use of Risk Register	7-5
Table 7.5	Fall Creek/White River CSO Tunnel Groundwater Risk Register	7-6

Figures

	Page	
Figure ES.1	Proposed Tunnel Alignment Alternatives	ES-2
Figure ES.2	Horizontal Boundaries of GWMP Model	ES-5
Figure ES.3	Illustration of GWMP Model Vertical Layers.....	ES-6
Figure 1.1	Proposed Tunnel Alignment Alternatives	1-3
Figure 2.1	Physiographic Divisions in Marion County and Proposed Tunnel Alignment Alternatives	2-2
Figure 2.2	Geology and Topography of the Pre-Wisconsin Surface in Marion County	2-4
Figure 2.3	Geology and Topography of the Bedrock Surface in Marion County	2-10
Figure 2.4	Preliminary Geologic Profile	2-11
Figure 2.5	Potentiometric Surface and Hydrogeologic Setting of the Shallow Aquifer in Marion County	2-12
Figure 4.1	Horizontal Boundaries of GWMP Model	4-3
Figure 4.2	Model Boundaries with IDNR Groundwater Contours	4-4
Figure 4.3	Illustration of GWMP Model Vertical Layers.....	4-6
Figure 4.4	Borings Used to Define Aquifer Layer Elevations	4-7
Figure 4.5	Surficial Aquifer Zones.....	4-8
Figure 4.6	Top of Bedrock in Contact with Bottom of Surficial Aquifer	4-9
Figure 4.7	Streams Simulated by GWMP Model	4-16

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Figure 4.8	Production Wells Simulated by GWMP Model.....	4-17
Figure 5.1	Phase 1A Piezometer Locations for Carbonate Aquifer	5-4
Figure 5.2	IDNR Monitoring Well Locations for Surficial Aquifer.....	5-5
Figure 5.3	Calibration for Surficial Aquifer	5-10
Figure 5.4	Calibration for Carbonate Aquifer	5-11
Figure 5.5	USGS Stream Gage and Phase 1A Piezometers	5-12
Figure 5.6	Trends for Surface Water and Groundwater Elevations Near the USGS White River at Indianapolis Stream Gage in 2006	5-13
Figure 5.7	Layer 1 Horizontal Hydraulic Conductivity and Horizontal-to-Vertical Hydraulic Conductivity Ratio.....	5-18
Figure 5.8	Layer 2 Horizontal Hydraulic Conductivity and Horizontal-to-Vertical Hydraulic Conductivity Ratio.....	5-19
Figure 5.9	Layer 3 Horizontal Hydraulic Conductivity and Horizontal-to-Vertical Hydraulic Conductivity Ratio.....	5-20
Figure 5.10	Layer 4 and 5 Horizontal Hydraulic Conductivity and Horizontal-to-Vertical Hydraulic Conductivity Ratio.....	5-21
Figure 5.11	Precipitation Recharge	5-22
Figure 5.12	Existing Conditions Model – Groundwater Budget	5-23
Figure 5.13	Existing Conditions Groundwater Contours for Surficial Aquifer	5-25
Figure 5.14	Existing Conditions Groundwater Contours for Upper Carbonate Aquifer.....	5-26
Figure 6.1	Tunnel Alignments	6-2
Figure 6.2	Cross Section along Tunnel Alignment	6-6
Figure 6.3	Use of Model Results to Determine Drawdown near Wells.....	6-8
Figure 6.4	Scenario 1 – West Tunnel Alignment, Expected Infiltration During Construction	6-9
Figure 6.5	Scenario 2 – Central Tunnel Alignment, Expected Infiltration During Construction (Model Layer 4)	6-10
Figure 6.6	Scenario 2 – Central Tunnel Alignment, Expected Infiltration During Construction (Model Layer 2)	6-11
Figure 6.7	Scenario 3 – East Tunnel Alignment, Expected Infiltration During Construction (Model Layer 4)	6-13

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Figure 6.8	Scenario 3 – East Tunnel Alignment, Expected Infiltration During Construction (Model Layer 2)	6-14
Figure 6.9	Scenario 3 – East Tunnel Alignment, Expected Infiltration During Construction (Model Layer 1)	6-15
Figure 6.10	Scenario 4 – West Tunnel Alignment, High Infiltration During Construction (Model Layer 4)	6-16
Figure 6.11	Scenario 4 – West Tunnel Alignment, High Infiltration During Construction (Model Layer 2)	6-17
Figure 6.12	Scenario 5 – Central Tunnel Alignment, High Infiltration During Construction (Model Layer 4)	6-18
Figure 6.13	Scenario 5 – Central Tunnel Alignment, High Infiltration During Construction (Model Layer 2)	6-19
Figure 6.14	Scenario 6 – East Tunnel Alignment, High Infiltration During Construction (Model Layer 4)	6-21
Figure 6.15	Scenario 6 – East Tunnel Alignment, High Infiltration During Construction (Model Layer 1)	6-22
Figure 6.16	Scenario 9 – East Tunnel Alignment, Expected Infiltration During Operation (Model Layer 4).....	6-23
Figure 6.17	Scenario 10 – West Tunnel Alignment, High Infiltration During Operation (Model Layer 4).....	6-24
Figure 6.18	Scenario 11 – Central Tunnel Alignment, High Infiltration During Operation (Model Layer 4).....	6-25
Figure 6.19	Scenario 12 – East Tunnel Alignment, High Infiltration During Operation (Model Layer 4).....	6-26
Figure 6.20	Scenario 11 – Central Tunnel Alignment, High Infiltration During Operation (Model Layer 2).....	6-27
Figure 6.21	Scenario 12 – East Tunnel Alignment, High Infiltration During Operation (Model Layer 1).....	6-28
Figure 6.22	Existing Wells along Tunnel Alignments	6-29
Figure 6.23	Extreme Scenario Modeling	6-35
Figure 6.24	Conceptual Illustration of Drawdown in Shallow Aquifers with High Vertical and Low Horizontal Hydraulic Conductivity.....	6-37

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Figure 6.25	Conceptual Illustration of Drawdown in Shallow Aquifers with High Vertical and High Horizontal Hydraulic Conductivity	6-38
Figure 6.26	Assumed High Hydraulic Conductivity for Carbonate Aquifer for Extreme Scenario B.....	6-40
Figure 6.27	Extreme Scenario B – Drawdown of Groundwater Levels for Shallow Aquifers	6-41
Figure 6.28	Assumed High Hydraulic Conductivity for Carbonate Aquifer for Extreme Scenario C.....	6-42
Figure 6.29	Tunnel Elevation Compared to Carbonate Groundwater Level.....	6-44
Figure 8.1	Fluctuations of Shallow Carbonate Groundwater Levels.....	8-5

APPENDICES

- Appendix A – Piezometer Readings and Survey Information
- Appendix B – Groundwater Risk Register
- Appendix C – Draft Report Comments and Responses